IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

TUESDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

And

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY

WRIT APPEAL NO : 1638 of 2004

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 17/09/2004 in WP NO : 16812 OF 2004 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

1 K.Narayanamma W/o.Ramanaiah
R/o.Isukapalli H/o.Tallapaka
Rajampet Mandal, Cuddapah District.
2 K.Venkata Subbamma W/o.Venkata Subbaiah
R/o.Isukapalli H/o.Tallapaka
Rajampet Mandal, Cuddapah District.
3 S.Lakshmamma W/o.Venkataiah
R/o.Isukapalli H/o.Tallapaka
Rajampet Mandal, Cuddapah District.

..... APPELLANTS

AND

1 The District Collector, Kadapa District.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajampet, Kadapa District.
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer Rajampet Mandal, Kadapa District.
4 The Sub Divisional Police Officer (SDPO), Rajampet, Kadapa District.
5 The Superintendent of Police Kadapa, Kadapa District.
6 Smt.C.Hymavathamma Sarpanch
Thallapaka, Rajampet Mandal,
Kadapa District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Appellant: MR.G.KRISHNA MURTHY
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 t o 5: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following:

ORAL JUDGMENT: (BSSR.J.)

This Writ Appeal is directed against the order of the learned single Judge passed in Writ Petition No.16812 of 2004, dated 17.9.2004.

2. The 2nd respondent superseded the order of the Mandal Revenue Officer with regard to the grant of pattas in favour of the petitioners and six others. Questioning the order of the 2nd respondent, the petitioners filed the above Writ Petition.

3. Heard the counsel appearing for the appellants.

4. The learned single Judge making the following observations, dismissed the Writ Petition by an order dated 17.9.2004:

> "Learned counsel for petitioners strenuously contends that before suspension of the house site pattas, which were granted in the petitioners' favour, they are entitled to notice and they cannot be dispossessed from the lands. I do not see any force in the said submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioners since the order itself repeats that they are attempting to enter into the said lands for constructing the huts and the suspension of the pattas is only pending enquiry into the matter. The petitioners are at liberty to file their explanation to the Revenue Divisional Officer before whom the appeal is pending and can raise objections.
>
> Learned counsel for the petitioner requests that petitioners are ready to file objections and the appellate authority may be directed to dispose of the appeal expeditiously, on petitioners filing their explanation within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
>
> In view of the same, the R.D.O. can conduct enquiry after providing due opportunity to the petitioners and pass appropriate orders within a period of six weeks from the date of filing such

explanation by the petitioners".

5. Since the Revenue Divisional Officer has been directed to conduct enquiry into the matter after affording due opportunity to the petitioners, we do not see any irregularity or illegality in the impugned order.

6. According the Writ Appeal is dismissed at the admission stage.

(K.C.BHANU, J.)

19th October, 2004.

(B.SESHASAYANA REDDY, J.)

SSR

To

1 The District Collector, Kadapa District.

2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Rajampet, Kadapa District.
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer Rajampet Mandal, Kadapa District.
4 The Sub Divisional Police Officer (SDPO), Rajampet, Kadapa District.
5 The Superintendent of Police Kadapa, Kadapa District.
6 2 copies to the G.P. for Revenue, High Court of A.P. Hyderabad.

7 2 CD copies